

REMARKS

None of the claims have been amended herein. Reconsideration of claims 1-22 is respectfully requested.

I. OBJECTION TO CLAIM 6:

At page 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that claim 6 contains allowable subject matter. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6 is still deemed allowable.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-2, 5, 7-8 AND 15-18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY KUBO ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,671,814; HEREINAFTER "KUBO"):

The Applicants respectfully submit that Kubo fails to disclose a "detecting means for detecting a signal peculiar to a universal serial bus (USB) obtained via the USB" and a "disconnecting means for disconnecting a line which is being used for a communication when the signal peculiar to the USB is not detected by said detecting means within a predetermined time" as recited in claim 1.

At pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that Kubo discloses these features at column 2, lines 1-33. However, the Applicants respectfully disagree.

Instead, at column 2, lines 7-33, and column 5, lines 5-42, Kubo merely discloses turning off the power supply from the host when a 0-state (i.e. "off" setting signal) of the USB is detected.

That is, Kubo fails to disclose "detecting a signal peculiar to the USB", as recited in claim 1. The Applicants respectfully submit that a "0-state of the USB" is not comparable to "a signal peculiar to the USB".

Although the above comments are specifically directed to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding differences of various other rejected claims over the cited reference. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Accordingly, claims 1-2, 5, 7-8 and 15-18 patentably distinguish over Kubo. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 3-4, 9-14 AND 19-22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER KUBO IN VIEW OF MATSUDA (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,211,649):

At page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner admits that Kubo fails to disclose "a wireless telephone set coupled to a communication device". However, the Examiner asserts that Matsuda teaches this feature.

The Applicants respectfully submit that although Matsuda discloses in FIG. 1, a wireless telephone set coupled to a communication device, Matsuda fails to make up for the deficiencies of Kubo mentioned above.

Accordingly, the combination of Kubo and Matsuda fails to establish a prima facie case of obviousness over the claimed invention. Thus, claims 3-4, 9-14 and 19-22 patentably distinguish over Kubo in view of Matsuda.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. CONCLUSION:

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore, defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

Jan 19, 2015

By:

Deidre M. Davis

Deidre M. Davis
Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501